C.3

N D

153438

Bibliography to Dead Creek Scoring Package

1. Cover letter dated March 25, 1985

2. Narrative Summary of Project

3. Revised Score Package

   a. HRS Score Sheets including cover sheet, GW route work sheet, SW route work sheet, air route work sheet, work sheet for computing S_m, F & E work sheet, and DC work sheet.

   b. Documentation Records for Hazardous Ranking System describing methods of scoring

   c. Work sheet for Hazardous Waste Site Ranking Model

   d. Attachment A: Contaminants detected off-site evidenced by:

      - groundwater quality in private wells (from Ron St. John report)

      - analysis of groundwater samples from IEPA wells on 10/23/80 (from Ron St. John Report)

      - analysis of groundwater samples from IEPA monitoring wells on 1/28/82 (from Ron St. John report)

   e. Attachment B: Hazardous Waste Quantity calculation

      *further documentation provided with this bibliography

      - Attachment B includes lab analysis results for 3 samples

   f. Attachment C: documents contaminants detected in creekbed (from Ron St. John report)

   g. Attachment D: documentation of air monitoring conducted 3/23/82. No map is available to show actual locations in creekbed other than entry was directly south of Queeny Avenue.

   h. Attachment E: Fire and Explosion documentation from previous score package prepared by USEPA - NO CHANGE.

4. Previous Score Package prepared by USEPA staff.

5. Ron St. John report (4/81).

SD:ds:0782E/20

Responses to questions from Jeanne Griffen on 4/9/85.

1. Bibliography?

   - provided

2. No air data in Ron St. John report?

   - The air data was collected by a USEPA contractor after completion of the St. John report.

3. Map for air monitoring?

   - We have no copy of any map which may have been prepared during air sampling. It is assumed that all air sampling was performed in the creek bed between Quenny Avenue and Judith Lane.

4. Further information on surface water and groundwater routes?

   - Ample documentation exists in the Ron St. John report and that is one reason why we feel the report in total must be included as documentation for the scoring package. The report supports the scores reflected in the score package.

5. How was waste characterization determined?

   - Known contaminants were examined for MITRE persistence and SAX toxicity.

6. Attachment B should be clarified to explain methods of estimation.

   - The quantities presented in Attachment B were quantities used in an IEPA bid for immediate clean-up which was not contracted. The estimates were calculated by in-field measurements by IEPA staff as follows:

     a. two oil pools estimated at 51 cubic yards

        1) 61 ft. x 23 ft. x 0.5 ft. = 701.5 cu. ft.
        2) 30 ft. x 45 ft. x 0.5 ft. = 675.0 cu. ft
        1376.5 cu. ft. = 51 cu. yds.

     b. Contaminated soil underlying "oil pools" and debris in "oil pools" for total estimated depth of 18 inches assuming 12 inches of soil and 6 inches of debris.

     c. Surficial drum quantity was estimated by counting drums and dividing by 3.7 cubic yards/drum -150 drums divided by 3.7 cu. yd./drum = 40 cu. yd.

d. solidified spill

- 34.5 ft. x 36 ft. x 0.5 ft. = 621 cu. ft. = 23 cu. yd.

- The other quantity used in Attachment B is documented by page 34 of the Ron St. John report "The Disposal Impoundment".

- IEPA notes that these are documented waste quantities and do not begin to consider the amount of contaminated material in the area. Use of the above quantities in scoring is very conservative.

7. How was target population determined?

a. No target population was used for groundwater.

b. Where population was used, population was as determined by census as used in USEPA score package.

SKD:rd0784E/35-36